UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/24212
30 June 1992

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 30 JUNE 1992 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF CROATIA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

I have the honour to convey to you the enclosed reply of the Government of the Republic of Croatia to the further report of the Secretary-General pursuant to Security Council resolution 752 (1992).

I would appreciate it if this letter and its enclosure were distributed as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Zvonimir SEPAROVIC
Minister of the Government
of Croatia

Ambassador
Permanent Representative of the
Republic of Croatia to the
United Nations

Annex

Letter dated 30 June 1992 from the President of the State Commission for the United Nations Protection Force addressed to the President of the Security Council

Please find enclosed the reply of the Government of the Republic of Croatia to the further report of the Secretary-General pursuant to Security Council resolution 752 (1992).

We kindly ask you to circulate it as a document of the Security Council for its consideration together with the report of the Secretary-General, S/24188, dated 26 June.

(Signed) Milan RAMLJAK
President of the State Commission
for UNPROFOR

Enclosure

Reply of the Croatian Government to the proposals put forward by the United Nations Secretary-General in his report S/24188 of 26 June 1992

Departing from the repeatedly expressed readiness of the Republic of Croatia to cooperate with UNPROFOR and other major United Nations authorities;

Departing from the fact that since the adoption of the United Nations peace plan the Republic of Croatia has been doing its utmost to contribute to its timely and successful implementation;

Departing from the fact that in a complex and difficult situation and owing to exceptional efforts by the Security Council and Cyrus Vance and his colleagues a consensus on the United Nations peace plan in the Republic of Croatia was reached;

Departing from the fact that since signing the Sarajevo cease-fire agreement the Serbian side violated the said agreement 8,072 times by 24 June 1992, killing 507 Croatian citizens (including 181 civilians and 16 children) and brutally expelling 1,891 persons from their homes in the occupied areas, whereas the Croatian side was patiently tolerating all these violations of the cease-fire, destructions, pillages and genocide being committed on the non-Serbian population;

Departing from the fact that the occupation troops continue to destroy the Croatian towns (Zupanja, Babina Greda, Slavonski Brod, Sisak, Šibenik, Zadar, Dubrovnik) - just to mention that only yesterday, 29 June 1992, the Dubrovnik Old City centre was struck by about 160 artillery shells which inflicted additional devastation, killed 4 persons and seriously injured 11 persons, including 4 children, and that fierce bombardment of the Sisak Refinery and Ironworks is under way;

Due to the aforementioned facts and considering the report by the Secretary-General pursuant to Security Council resolution 752 (1992), document S/24188 of 26 June 1992, the Government of the Republic of Croatia wants to make the following comments:

1. In spite of all the violations of the cease-fire agreement through actions against the Republic of Croatia and all the atrocities committed by the occupation troops against the population of our Republic, the Croatian Government, even in a situation like this, is anxious to act in a way which would make a maximum contribution to the speediest possible and complete assumption of responsibility and control by UNPROFOR in all sectors, as precisely defined by the peace plan.

However, as explicitly pointed out by the Secretary-General himself in his latest report of 26 June, the Vance plan does not oblige the Republic of

Croatia to agree to any border extension of any zone in any United Nations Protected Areas (UNPA) sector.

Therefore, the Government of the Republic of Croatia cannot accept any UNPA border extension nor a change in any part of the peace plan, such as the proposed ethnic composition of the police forces in the "pink zones" and temporary retainment of the local police forces in other parts of Croatia outside UNPA. It should be pointed out that such extensions can in no way be justified by the current events. That is why we see no justification for the "strong pressure" being allegedly exerted by the Belgrade authorities all the time.

The Croatian Government feels that the problem of the "pink zones" has been invented in order to get the parts of the occupied territories incorporated in UNPA, although not envisaged so by the peace plan. This is illustrated by the report released from the meeting between UNPROFOR deputy commander, General P. Morillon, and the Deputy Chief-of-Staff of the Croatian Army, General P. Stipetić, held on 25 June 1992 at Karlovac. It was concluded during the meeting that all questions were clarified and no reasons whatsoever existed for any further delay in the assumption of responsibility by UNPROFOR in Sectors North and South.

General Morillon declared that he saw no obstacles and that he would so notify General Nambiar, whom he shortly expected to make a decision on the said assumption of responsibility.

2. In spite of the fact that the Republic of Croatia, as implied in document S/24188, is not obliged to agree to any modifications of the peace plan, we have carefully studied the proposals put forward by the Secretary-General under paragraphs 16 and 17 of his report, motivated by our wish to do as much as possible for the successful implementation of the UNPROFOR operation.

The Government of the Republic of Croatia has the following comments on the said proposals:

(a) To speed up the UNPROFOR operation and to enhance confidence in the operation as a whole and although not obliged by the peace plan, we suggested that the European Community monitors and the UNPROFOR military observers should be present for some time in the "pink zones". Accordingly, Croatia is ready to discuss the question of setting up joint commissions as proposed by the Secretary-General in his report. These commissions, chaired by UNPROFOR, may be composed of the Croatian Government representatives, European Community monitors and the representatives of legally elected municipal assemblies;

Our acceptance of such joint commissions is based on our conviction that maximum effort should be made in ethnically mixed areas to restore trust and confidence and that for this reason such joint commissions ought to be set up not only in the "pink zones", but also in all municipalities within UNPA;

(b) Considering the presence of European Community monitors and UNPROFOR military observers and the setting up of the said joint commissions, we believe that no engagement of the UNPROFOR civil police is needed in the process of restoration of the Croatian authority in the "pink zones";

(c) We also feel that the present confrontation line must not be maintained through some actions, as suggested in the Secretary-General's report and cannot be treated as a sort of division of Croatia outside UNPA. This would contradict the spirit of the UNPROFOR mandate;

(d) We have reiterated our readiness to withdraw simultaneously our troops and military equipment to an agreed distance from UNPA and within agreed schedules; however, demilitarization of any area outside UNPA is not envisaged by the peace plan and is unacceptable in terms of our national security;

(e) The Republic of Croatia is aware of the importance of amnesties as a means of restoring confidence, tolerance and internal stability, but the imposition of the amnesty provision as a condition for implementation of the peace plan (para. 16 (f) of the Secretary-General's report) is utterly unacceptable;

In compliance with the basic principles of a lawful State, decisions on granting amnesties are made by the Croatian Parliament, not the Croatian Government. By the way, the new membership of the Parliament will be constituted after general elections scheduled for 2 August 1992;

(f) Having accepted the international supervision of the restoration of the Croatian authority in the "pink zones", we must remind of the fact that this resumption of authority is supposed to take place along with the withdrawal of the occupation troops from these areas. The Republic of Croatia rejects any, even a temporary international administration on any area outside UNPA;

(g) We must also recall the fact that nearly four months have passed since the arrival of UNPROFOR, and not even their responsibility in all sectors has been assumed nor the deadlines fixed.

Hence our insistence on the need to work out the timetable of the operation as soon as possible, because any further delays and giving forced concessions would only encourage the Serbian side and result in intolerable material destruction and human suffering for the Republic of Croatia. This would prevent provocative and aggressive bombardments by the Serbian aggressor as well as the need for the Croatian Army to respond to them by taking actions within the "pink zones".

3. News from New York has reached us in the course of 30 June 1992 on some rumours launched from Belgrade about the alleged intention of the Croatian Army to demolish the Peruča Dam on the river Cetina designed to cause enormous destruction and an ecological disaster over the whole area in question. These

"accusations" are so perfidious and unfounded that they are hardly worth commenting on. However, experience with Serbian propaganda suggests that the real objective of such accusations and inventions is to jeopardize the implementation of the peace plan and deliberately to attribute the responsibility for it to the Croatian side. The actual situation in the field is completely different. We can give our best assurances that no actions by the Croatian Army took place on 29 June 1992, which was subsequently checked by us after the protest lodged by General Nambiar. The command by the General Chief-of-Staff was renewed to all the Croatian units to observe strictly the cease-fire instructions.

4. The report of the United Nations Secretary-General (para. 2 thereof) refers to the "pink zones" as areas of the Republic of Croatia "populated largely by Serbs", which is not true. The statistical data provide a clear demographic picture of the areas and are enclosed herewith for consideration by any interested party.

5. On the basis of the above comments, the Republic of Croatia is ready to discuss the proposal made by the United Nations Secretary-General in his report S/24188, however it should be pointed out that any imposition of any of these proposed measures through a Security Council resolution or a statement by the President of the Security Council, would actually mean a formal modification of the existing peace plan, which is legally unacceptable within a peace-keeping operation such as UNPROFOR.

In response to recent statements by the United Nations Secretary-General, UNPROFOR Commander Brigadier General J. K. Rob, and the international media, who repeatedly referred to the District of Drniš, in the "pink zone", as a Serbian majority area, the Croatian Ministry of Information wishes to clarify the matter by presenting the following map and graph. Special emphasis has been put on the Miljevci region, which the Croatian Army liberated last week.

DISTRICT OF DRNIŠ

	AREA (SQ. KM.)	TOTAL POPULATION	CROATS TOTAL:	CROATS %	SERBS TOTAL:	SERBS %	OTHERS TOTAL:	OTHERS %
OCCUPIED REGIONS - "PINK ZONE":								
MA"ASE		172	165	95.9%	3	1.7%	4	2.3%
BOBODOL		182	30	16.5%	149	81.9%	3	1.6%
LUKAR		214	199	93.0%	10	4.7%	5	2.3%
LJUBOTIĆ		113	112	99.1%	0		1	0.9%
SUKNOVCI		162	153	94.4%	6	3.7%	3	1.9%
PULJANE		159	154	96.9%	0		5	3.1%
ČITLUK		272	272	100.0%	0		0	
OKLAJ		485	462	95.3%	4	0.8%	19	3.9%
MRATOVO		204	183	90%	17	8.3%	4	2.0%
BOGETIĆ		190	190	100.0%	0		0	
RAZVODE		507	337	66.5%	160	31.6%	10	2.0%
VELUŠIĆ		275	122	44.4%	147	53.5%	6	2.2%
LIŠNJAK		17	16	94.1%	1	5.9%	0	
TRBOUNJE		487	482	99.0%	1	0.2%	4	0.8%
BADANJ		418	401	95.9%	12	2.9%	5	1.2%
DRNIŠ		4653	3447	74.1%	1021	21.9%	185	4.0%
TEPLJUH		433	64	14.8%	360	83.1%	9	2.1%
BIOČIĆ		401	2	0.5%	378	94.3%	21	5.2%
MIOČIĆ		415	10	2.4%	402	96.9%	3	0.7%
ŠTIKOVO		360	30	8.3%	324	90.0%	6	1.7%
SIVERIĆ		992	881	88.8%	97	9.8%	14	1.4%
PARČIĆ		258	251	97.3%	0		7	2.7%
KADINA GLAVICA		510	362	71.0%	138	27.1%	10	2.0%
KAMJANE		233	20	8.6%	213	91.4%	0	
OTAVICE		283	271	95.8%	2	0.7%	10	3.5%
BALJCI		470	13	2.8%	453	96.4%	4	0.9%
MRLOVIĆ POLJE		477	281	58.9%	188	39.4%	8	1.7%
GRADAC		412	396	96.1%	8	1.9%	8	1.9%
RUŽIĆ		463	358	77.3%	98	21.2%	7	1.5%
KRIČKE		717	261	36.4%	445	62.1%	11	1.5%
ŽITNIĆ		510	242	47.5%	257	50.4%	11	2.2%
TOTAL		15444	10167	65.8%	4894	31.7%	383	2.5%
MILJEVCI REGION:								
KIJUĆ		300	300	100.0%	0		0	
DRNOVCI		471	465	98.7%	3	0.6%	3	0.6%
BRIŠTANE		420	411	97.9%	2	0.5%	7	1.7%
BOGATIĆ		104	91	87.5%	13	12.5%	0	
KARALIĆ		165	161	97.6%	1	0.6%	3	1.8%
ŠIRITOVCI		338	338	100.0%	0		0	
KAOČINE		392	387	98.7%	0		5	1.3%
TOTAL		2190	2153	98.3%	19	0.9%	18	0.8%

SOURCE: 1991 CENSUS - THE CROATIAN BUREAU OF STATISTICS (ZAGREB)

/...

DISTRICT OF DRNIŠ